

would hope that we did not have a proposal that took away choice from our seniors. But today we have a proposal that includes \$270 billion in cuts, and then it includes, in the Senate proposal, to place a burden on the backs of our senior citizens, to eliminate their choice and the reasonable decisions that they make to select a medical provider by vouchering them their Medicare services.

I would ask that as we look toward the future, that the hopes would be based more upon a bipartisan approach to solving the Medicare problem; that we would realize that although we all look to provide security and safety for Medicare into the 21st century, we cannot voucher our way and allot our way into that safety.

My hope would be that we could come to the bipartisan table and recognize that fraud and abuse are ways of downsizing the problems of Medicare, but the loss of \$270 billion is not.

I would hope that we would be able to say to the senior citizens that we would work collectively with some of the suggestions that have been made in order to ensure a system that works into the 21st century. I would hope that we could say that to our rural hospital systems, our urban hospital systems, as well our local and State governments who will bear the burden of this loss.

And then I would say that maybe we can keep the dream alive, and that is the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, and not divide this House on the issue of race and affirmative action.

I would hope that this week, beginning July 24, we would not have a frivolous and fruitless debate on eliminating affirmative action tied to the Department of Defense appropriation bill without any manner of hearings or documentation that the abuse has been such that requires this kind of amendment.

I hope that this Nation realizes that race is still a factor, that discrimination is still prevalent, that the dream of Dr. King is trying to survive, but it is not yet there. And I would hope this House, in its wisdom, the leadership of this House, would not allow such a destructive, divisive amendment to come to the floor, especially when no documentation in this House has yet been established as to which direction to go to respond to the concerns of the American people who, I believe, believe in equality for all.

And so the dream this evening is that we would come together recognizing that some of our dreams have not yet been met and that affirmative action is not the fight to take the U.S. Congress and particularly the House of Representatives in its most imperfect sense, by an amendment that has no justification and has no reason to eliminate this very vital program that allows people to have equal opportunity.

And then I hope we will reach to our aspirations, and that is that we can

likewise come together in a bipartisan manner as we look towards space, as we understand our destiny as Americans, as we realize that the space station is not just another piece of iron machinery, but it is based upon the aspirations of Americans.

It emphasizes our ability to explore and search and find and discover. It helps us in medical research; it helps us determine the maximum capacity of the human body; it helps us understand where we will go in the 21st century as it relates to science.

It is not a space station of local regions; it is a space station of America. And just as we aspired to go to the Moon and looked in hope and dreamed about being an astronaut and celebrated the successes when Americans made their first steps on the Moon, here now we have an opportunity to associate and cooperate with our European partners, our Russian partners. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to allow our children to dream, to then work, but to create better opportunities and a better quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by simply saying, let us have hope for a better Medicare system to save it for our senior citizens, let us dream for equality for all Americans and thereby eliminate divisive talk about affirmative action and race in this Nation, and let us aspire, yes, and dream for the 21st century so that we too can find out what makes the space tick, if you will, and find a better way to live in all the research that will be brought about through the space station.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to the House this evening about a subject that does not seem at times to be the sexiest topic around here, although I think at times it does draw a great deal of emotion from many of the Members as was demonstrated when we began to and finished the debate on the ag appropriation bill.

It is a subject that I know many Members are very interested in and that is the subject commonly referred to as agriculture.

When I was running for election to this House, I told the people in my district that I wanted to serve on the Committee on Agriculture because of the importance of agriculture to my district, to the country, but because my district has had a very rich heritage of representation on the ag committee from former Congressman Paul Finley, who was the ranking member of the Ag Committee when he left the

Congress in 1982; Congressman Ed Madigan, the late Ed Madigan, who was the ranking member and then went on to serve as the Secretary of Agriculture; and then my former boss and mentor, the former Republican leader, Bob Michel, who was on the ag appropriations subcommittee for 25 years.

We have had a rich heritage in my district of representing agriculture, and that is something that I wanted to continue.

And there are three goals that I want to lay out and say to the American people that we need to strive for as we mark up the ag bill: No. 1, farm programs should not be singled out for spending cuts. All Federal programs should be on the table. Agriculture is willing to take its fair share, and I know that.

From talking to the farmers in my district, I know they are willing to take their fair share. They have taken their fair share over the last 10 years and when you look at the decreases in agriculture programs, while all other programs of Government have increased, agriculture has taken its fair share.

No. 2, spending cuts should go to reduce the deficit, not to spend on other programs, as has been the case in the last 10 years.

And finally, Congress must deliver on promises to roll back the tidal wave of burdensome regulation, provide consistency and predictability in our export markets and restore fairness and sanity to our Tax Code. I think if we could meet those three goals, we would be serving agriculture well and serving all Americans.

I am joined this evening by three distinguished colleagues from the House of Representatives, and I would like to provide an opportunity for them to sound off for a minute or two about some important issues related to agriculture in their districts.

I think what I would like to do is yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], who comes here from an agricultural district, and having been appointed by the Speaker of the House to chair a task force for those members who do not sit on the Ag Committee and are not intimately involved in the everyday workings, as some of us are, for whatever comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], and welcome his comments with respect to what he has been doing with his task force and other matters that he would like to address the House with.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much not only for yielding but for his participation as a Member of the Task Force on Agriculture that Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ROBERTS, the chairman of the Ag Committee have approved as something that is vitally important to the agriculture industry in this country.

You have been very involved in this task force, Mr. LAHOOD, and I really appreciate your input and your advice and your good counsel.

There is no question but that agriculture is extremely important not only to my State and my district, but these United States of America. We, I think, are many times in this country too easily swayed to say that all farmers are wealthy and that they do not need any assistance or participation with the U.S. Government; that is just not the truth.

Agriculture has gotten a bad rap over the years, and we are here, I think, representing our respective districts to try to bring some perspective on the issue of what agriculture does for America, and what the government can do to assist in a partnership with agriculture to make America more successful.

We do have a wonderful task force, about 33 Members, freshmen and others, who are not from the Committee on Agriculture but are from agriculture-producing districts that care about agriculture, and that care about rural America.

And that is really what agriculture is about, not only to America as a whole and the exports that agriculture brings to this country and the benefits of exports, but the benefits to rural America. And that is really the middle part of this country and really all parts of the Nation, especially the Northwest, which I am happy to represent and proud to represent.

I am from the 5th district of Washington, as you know, and we have a tremendous wheat market there. We have oats and barley, we have apples and cherries and about every agriculture product we can imagine. We export about 90 percent of our agriculture products that are grown in my district, so programs that enhance exports and assist in the balance of trade in America are very helpful not only in my district but the rest of the country.

There are a couple of programs that I think are worthy of discussion tonight for just a few minutes, and I am not going to take too long. The Export Enhancement Program is a program that was developed in 1985 as part of the farm bill, which was a vehicle for enabling American agriculture to compete with foreign governments who assist their farm sectors in reaching worldwide markets.

As I said, 90 percent or so of the wheat that goes from Washington State is exported, and it results in millions and millions of dollars to the balance of trade. It provides 30,000-some-odd jobs in our State and it affects exports in virtually every State in the United States of America.

The Export Enhancement Program is a vehicle for America to compete with foreign governments where they are unfairly competing in the world market for ag sales. In 1980, you may remember President Carter imposed the embargo on the Soviet Union. That was devastating to agriculture because it took away by unilateral action of our country the ability to sell in foreign countries like the Soviet Union.

As a result, our market share in the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, and other countries throughout the world has suffered. The Export Enhancement Program, which was developed in 1985 tries to remedy this imbalance and this inequity.

This year, as we passed the Agriculture appropriations bill just last week, we provided \$800 million in assistance for all agricultural commodities that are eligible for Export Enhancement protection and that is going to help farmers and rural America, and it is going to help the American economy.

Those are the kinds of programs that I think get distorted in the media and get distorted in the debate on this House floor, and that is unjustified. The Export Enhancement Program is a minimal way that the Federal Government can assist agriculture in the United States.

We have to have our American farmers able to compete in these world markets not only by Export Enhancement Assistance by the government, but in the area of research. Most small farmers and cooperatives of farmers are unable to garner the support and the financial commitment to conduct the very extensive research that needs to be done so that we can compete in markets like China and Japan and Australia and other places.

The U.S. Government has a role in providing research funds, and we are doing that in this agriculture appropriations bill.

We also want to make sure we promote our markets worldwide. Other countries promote their products in America and throughout the rest of the world. Our country should do the same. There is a minimal amount of money in the agriculture appropriations bill to do that, so I think we all have to be aware and take a part of the education requirements that we have to make sure America understands the importance of agriculture.

□ 2245

It is not a sexy subject or an exciting subject, but it is a very vital subject that is very, very important to millions of Americans around this country.

I want to thank you for allowing me to have a chance to talk a little bit about the export enhancement program. I want all the Members to remember that particular program and support it. The Market Promotion Program is a good, wise use of American tax dollars, and ag research is very, very important to allow our farmers to compete in worldwide markets.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman from Washington for bringing out those important points, and I wonder if the gentleman would just spend another minute or two talking about your task force and what you see your task force doing now that we are finishing with the ag appropriations bill, but we still have to mark up the au-

thorization bill and authorize a number of programs, how you see your task force working, and then ultimately reporting to Speaker GINGRICH and the House on what you have been doing.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Well, that task force, I think, is a very import one because we passed the appropriations bill just last week, but we have the so-called farm bill. Every 5 years as the gentleman knows, we reauthorize farm programs and farm policy in this country, which includes food stamps and Women, Infants, and Children funding as well as commodity supports and price supports and other programs within the Department of Agriculture.

Our task force is mobilized to the point where we are bringing a diverse range of views to the Committee on Agriculture as it formulates a 1995 ag bill, a farm bill for the next 5 or 7 years. So we want to have input as nonmembers of the Committee on Agriculture to that committee and let you all know and others know that agriculture, whatever the particular aspect may be, is very important, and we want to have a voice in the formulation and preparation of the ag bill. We will be meeting periodically in this House of Representatives. We will be holding public meetings throughout our respective districts across the country to have input from the farmer and the banker and the local community person who depends on agriculture to make sure that the Committee on Agriculture is clearly aware of our views and America's views on what a farm bill should look like in 1995 and beyond.

At a time where we are feeling tremendous budget pressure on agriculture, I think we need to have that extra input, and I am very thankful to all the Members who are part of this ag task force as we form these various opinion discussions and have a chance to have input into the process. We have not had that before to the extent that we will this year, and I thank you and Chairman ROBERTS and everybody else, Speaker GINGRICH as well, who cares very deeply about agriculture, and so that we have a strong agriculture policy. I think that, in a changing world, we want to be sure that we use good judgment as we form a new farm bill in 1995 that affects millions of people across this country.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman very much for his contributions.

Two other gentlemen have joined us, one from North Carolina, Mr. JONES, and one from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and both of you gentlemen were involved in the discussions as we were talking about the ag appropriations bill, and I know that you will be involved as we mark up the 1995 farm bill. Each of you comes to the House representing a different part of the country in a sense and also a different region of the country and certainly different interests as they relate to agriculture, and I think it would be interesting for you to sound off for a few

minutes about the kind of interest that you have, one involving tobacco in North Carolina, one involving peanuts in Georgia, and two areas that I am sure are very misunderstood by the American people and by many people in this House, by the way, and I think it would be enlightening.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for whatever comments he may have with respect to tobacco, to agriculture as it relates to your district or other matters related to this.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I am delighted to be part of your program tonight.

I also serve on the Ag task force. I am not on the Committee on Agriculture, even though in my third district of North Carolina agriculture is extremely important, from tobacco, which we grow more tobacco in my district than anywhere in the world, hog farming, turkey farming, corn, peanuts, not to the degree of the gentleman from Georgia. All of this is very important to my district.

I appreciate having the opportunity as you know, with the Durbin amendment, I guess our colleague from Illinois, that I think took a shot, if you will, at tobacco farmers. I just wanted to give you tonight some brief information on my district and my State, because, as you said, so many people throughout America are just not as informed as I think they should be about the tobacco program as it is and also what it means to this Nation.

Most of us from North Carolina feel very strongly that youth, people 18 years and younger, should not be smoking cigarettes, and there is a State law that prevents that from happening. But we do feel adults, those 18 years and older, it is their constitutional right to make a decision whether they want to smoke or not. I do not smoke cigarettes. I do not have any tobacco allotments. But my wife does smoke, and that is her privilege.

But what we feel that this really is coming down to is a constitutional right, if you will, for an individual to make that decision whether he or she wants to smoke.

Let me tell you just a few facts about my district and my State, and then after the gentleman from Georgia speaks, I will be glad to answer any questions from you.

In my district alone, which are 19 counties, there are 11,500 tobacco farms in my district, in 19 counties. The average tobacco farmer in my district farms less than 4 acres, so hardly can he or she be considered a corporate entity, if you will. The small tobacco farmer also contributes more than \$30 million annually in various assessments. Tobacco growing requires about 250 man-hours of labor per acre harvested. Let me repeat that real quickly, 250 man-hours of labor per acre harvested.

By comparison, it takes about 3 man-hours to grow and harvest an acre of wheat.

The local and State taxes levied on the tobacco farmer, which accounts for \$250 million in North Carolina, is used to make improvements to infrastructure, schools, community projects, churches, that again we are just talking about my district alone. Again, remember, this is a freedom-of-choice issue with the individual that would like to smoke, the adult male or female.

In the State of North Carolina, the tobacco industry is one of the most significant economic forces in our State. The State leads the Nation in growing tobacco, warehousing, manufacturing, wholesale, triad of tobacco and tobacco products. The State employs, these are tobacco workers now, to the gentleman from Illinois, 154,713 individuals that are employed that work in tobacco at an estimate of \$1.6 billion. Also, in addition to the 154,000 people that work directly with tobacco, we have 260,000 people that have tobacco-related employment that earn a total of \$5.8 billion. More specifically, one in 12 people are employed by the tobacco industry in the State of North Carolina.

So if you look at what the FDA Director, Dr. Kessler, and I say loosely, and I will talk about that a little bit later, if you will, that wants to classify nicotine as a drug, which we think he is way out of bounds on that, in that position, when I share those numbers with the people that are employed and what it means in salaries and revenue, the tobacco industry in North Carolina alone contributes \$2.7 billion annually to the Federal Government in tax revenue, an additional \$582 million to the State of North Carolina.

Just a couple of other points, then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia. Let us talk about the Federal Government and what the tobacco industry and growers in my district in the South mean to the United States Government. In 1994 the Federal excise on cigarettes grossed a total tax of \$5.7 billion. Federal, State, and local taxes on cigarettes in the year 1994 amounted to nearly \$12.5 billion or \$49 per man, woman, and child. That is a great deal of money.

Every year, the Federal Government counts on \$25.9 billion in tobacco-related revenues, compared to the approximately \$16 billion it costs the USDA to administer the program.

The reason I share those figures with you and the gentleman from Georgia, which you both know, to begin with is that so many times the citizens of this United States do not realize what the tobacco industry means to the Federal Government. Quite frankly, in this era of budget cutting, as we should be doing, and I am a new freshman Member, as you well know, and I support all the budget cuts, how in the world would we make up \$25.9 billion in revenues that are generated by the tobacco industry? Would it go back to the taxpayer? I think the taxpayers would not like that at all.

So, in closing, and I look forward to talking a little bit later about the FDA and their regulations and how they, Mr. Kessler and the Clinton administration, are turning on nicotine, trying to designate it or classify it as a drug, which we think it should not be, and how they are dropping the ball, meaning taking 14 years to approve a pharmaceutical company that is trying to develop a drug that is trying to save someone's life.

I hope the gentleman from Illinois will pick this up a little bit later, but I am delighted to have a few minutes to share some of these facts with the individuals that might be watching us tonight to let them know that tobacco is a freedom-of-choice issue for the adult that would like to smoke, and what it does in generating revenues for the Federal Government, State and local governments.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I want to give an opportunity for the gentleman from Georgia to talk about another program that we will be working on as a part of the 5-year farm bill authorization, and certainly was an issue that came up in the ag appropriation bill, maybe not highlighted as much as it has been in years past, but it is a program that I know is misunderstood by the American people, but it is a very important program that has to do with the peanut program, and I know that there are other areas that you are interested in.

But I think it would be enlightening, if you will, for the American people to have some sense of some of the issues that revolve around that particular program and any other issue that you would like to enlighten us about.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

It has been a real pleasure to serve on the House Committee on Agriculture since I have been here from January 4 forward, and probably the greatest pleasure that I have in serving on that Committee on Agriculture is the fact that I get to sit next to you in our full committee hearings, and I so much enjoy the gentleman's comments on the side about what is going on in the hearings, and it is thoroughly enlightening to hear the gentleman from Illinois make hear the gentleman from Illinois make his comments about what the witnesses say and particularly what they do not say. It has been a real pleasure.

You are correct, I do come from a peanut-producing district. My State of Georgia produces 42 percent of the peanuts that are grown in the United States. The United States is the third largest peanut-producing country in the world right now, and my district, the Eighth district of Georgia, is the second largest peanut-producing district in the United States, the district that adjoins me, the second district, being the largest district.

I come from a very strong agricultural background. I come from Colquitt

County, Georgia, the most diversified agricultural county east of the Mississippi River. We not only grow peanuts, we grow an awful lot of cotton, tobacco, corn, livestock, cattle, all sorts of product. In fact, my son-in-law is a farmer in Colquitt County. He grows a little bit of peanuts, a little bit of tobacco, primarily produce. We grow a lot of squash, peppers, cabbage, eggplant, about any kind of produce you can imagine. I do come from a very strong agricultural background.

I talked a lot on the campaign trail last year about the fact that the agricultural economy of this country is still the backbone of this Nation's economy, and without a good strong agricultural economy, this country is in real trouble. You know, what makes it so interesting for the four of us to sit here and talk about this, I mean we have got somebody from Illinois, we have got somebody from Washington, somebody from North Carolina, somebody from Georgia. All of us, really, from an agricultural standpoint, we come from varied backgrounds, but we all believe in the same thing, and that is a good strong agricultural economy, and I believe in the corn program just as much as you do, and you have been a strong supporter of the programs in my district and Walter and George likewise. I think that is what makes this House such a great institution that we can bring those kinds of ideas from all over the country together.

Let me just dwell for just a minute on the peanut program, because as you mentioned, it came under fire a little bit last week. It has every year in this House of Representatives for the last several years. Some people in leadership positions have come out strongly in opposition to the peanut program.

□ 2300

Let me just tell you, those folks really have never been out to south Georgia to see peanuts grown in the field or see the farmers that are growing those peanuts, or else they would have a much greater appreciation for that program than what they have.

We have an awful lot of folks who sit up here in their ivory towers in Washington and New York and other think tanks in this country and criticize not only the peanut program, but all other agriculture programs as being bad for the economy of this country and something that we need to do away with.

Mr. Speaker, those folks that sit in those ivory towers have never gone out and grown a garden, they do not know whether those peanuts grow on a tree or underground, much less how a cornfield looks or how a cotton field looks. The folks who are out there on a day-to-day basis and driving tractors and planters and harvesters, those are the folks that make America go, and those are the folks that we in this House need to concentrate on, and those are the folks that we are concentrating on.

I got carried away and I apologize. But the peanut program is a very com-

plex and complicated program. It is concentrated on a small area, from Texas basically, although there is a little bit grown in New Mexico. It moves eastward all the way to the coast, with the peanuts primarily being concentrated in the Georgia and Alabama area, the largest number of them.

Mr. Speaker, the peanut program that we have in place now is a supply side managed system, as are all farm programs. First of all, let me dispel one myth; that is, the peanut program is not an expensive program. People that are critics of the program talk about how much money it costs and if we did away with it, how much money we would save. That is a real myth. The peanut program itself has cost the American taxpayer an average of \$15 million a year over the last 10 years. That pales in comparison, not only to other farm programs, but other programs. That is not a large amount of money.

The myth that the peanut program costs the consumer money at the grocery store is something else that I want to dispel. We have had testimony by two people, one who is a manufacturer, and one who is the current Secretary of Agriculture, over the last several months who have been asked the specific question, if the peanut price were reduced, would that decrease the price of peanut products to the housewife at the grocery store. Both of them have been directly and emphatically said no, it would not.

We get a lot of criticism about the fact that the peanut program costs the taxpayer or the housewife \$500 million a year, and that is simply wrong. Again, it is those folks that are sitting in those ivory towers that are making those off-the-wall statements that have no idea about what they are talking about.

The program is more complex because of the fact that it is a quota-type system. You will hear people stand on the floor of this House during our debate over the peanut program in September and they will tell you that the only way that you can grow peanuts and get the highest price for them is to have a Federal license. Well, being a supply-side program, it is controlled by the Federal Government. The Federal Government decides who has quota peanuts and who does not.

Anybody can grow peanuts. There is simply no restriction on anybody from growing peanuts. There is a restriction on those folks who are allowed to participate in the program, the same way as there are limitations on folks going out and building a radio station and operating a radio station, operating a TV station, building a hospital, operating anything where you are required to get a license. There are controls that come out of the Federal Government.

So the peanut program is something that has received unfair criticism because of the myths that are outstanding out there.

Be that as it may, the folks who are involved from a grower, manufacturing and a sheller standpoint have been working on reforms in the peanut program for the last eight or nine months since I have been elected to Congress and we have been working very hard on it. We have met on a regular basis time and time again to make reforms in the peanut program that number one, are going to move it to a no-net cost program so that it would no longer cost the American taxpayer one dime.

Second, we are going to make it more market-oriented. We are going to do things such as allow for the sale and the transfer of peanut quota across county lines, so that anybody who wants to get involved in the peanut growing business with quota peanuts can do so. They simply make the same investment that those folks who now own quota have made over the years.

We are also going to move the peanut program into the 21st century where we will have to comply with the terms of NAFTA and GATT. We know that all farm programs have got to transition to that point, and we are going to be able to do that through the implementation of a more market-oriented system.

The third thing we are going to do is we are going to continue to provide a safety net to the farmers of this country who grow peanuts to ensure that they are able to continue to grow them and to make some sort of return on the investment that they have made. Those are the types of things that we are doing, and it is a very complicated program, as are all farm programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great leader in the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. PAT ROBERTS, who is moving all of us on the Agriculture Committee towards designing farm programs all across the agricultural spectrum to allow us to move into that 21st century with a good, solid farm bill over the next 5 years. I am kind of excited about it. It has given the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] and myself an opportunity to be a part of what I think is implementing the most important farm bill that we have ever had to deal with in this country, because it is a farm bill that is going to dictate how our children and our grandchildren are able to farm for the next generation.

Mr. LAHOOD. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, and your contribution here in trying to enlighten those of us who need enlightening about that program and other programs that we will be considering as a part of the 1995 farm bill.

Our time is limited here. Let me throw out one other issue and get a response. I think the thing that drives people, particularly those in agriculture in my district up the wall, if you will, or drives them a little crazy is this idea of overregulation, the idea that some agency of the Federal Government can come in and designate, for example, a part of their land as a wetland, or they can designate it as an

area that cannot be used for growing crops.

I have heard, like so many of the other people in this House, and Mr. CHAMBLISS, I am sure that you hear the complaints about overregulation. We passed a good regulatory reform bill. We need to do more. We are going to be working on reform of EPA and OSHA and FDA and some other agencies that have frankly gone too far, and try and bring the pendulum back, bring back some common sense.

In the Transportation Committee we passed a clean water bill which I think brings common sense back to this idea that the Government can come in and just dictate to local government or State government or to an individual farmer or rancher that they have to do certain things. I know that this whole definition of wetland has been a real problem in the area that I come from, and I would be curious to know if Mr. JONES from North Carolina or Mr. CHAMBLISS from Georgia has encountered that from any of your constituents that you could cite for us as an example or two of some areas where we have just gone overboard in some of these things.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would yield a moment, I will be glad to share with you that 60 percent of my district, which again is the third district of North Carolina, is considered wetland, 60 percent. We held a congressional hearing about 4 months ago down in my district, Congressman POMBO from California and the members of the committee, and I also serve on that committee. We had a public hearing, and I will never forget the story of one farmer. There are many stories I would like to share with you, but because of time I will share this one with you.

A young farmer who was probably in his late 30s had inherited farmland from his father and grandfather. He had been farming that property up until about 6 years ago. Then, all of a sudden, from the bureaucracy, they determined that part of that farmland was wetlands. So he does not farm any more. He cannot afford to.

He made a very compelling presentation to the committee. You are absolutely right, the Endangered Species Act, the Wetlands Act, all of these regulations have gone too far, and all that this new majority is trying to do, which I am delighted, as you two gentlemen are, to be part of this new majority, is to find some middle ground, some balance.

I do not know anyone in our party that is not concerned by what is truly, I use that word truly, an endangered species or wetland. But we have seen the extremists go too far and we are trying to bring it back to a balance, and I can assure the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Georgia that the farmers in my district are extremely pleased to see this new majority deal with these issues and try to find some fairness.

Mr. LAHOOD. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, one thing that was somewhat surprising to me when I got up here, I thought that by being from Georgia, we are pretty close to sea level, we have the Okefinokee Swamp not too far from my district. I thought we were the only ones that had wetlands problems.

□ 2310

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I come up here and I find out that the gentleman from North Carolina says 60 percent of his district is; and Illinois has severe wetland problems; Idaho, North Dakota, all over this country folks have wetland problems, and it is a very expensive issue to deal with. It is one issue that we have got to provide relief to the agriculture community. It is one area that we can provide relief that will make them more efficient farmers and allow them to produce a crop at less cost, because we know that we are going to have less money to deal with as far as farm programs are concerned. It is one thing that we can do to make the agricultural community a better place to make a living.

We have numerous situations down in my area regarding fields where we have center pivot irrigations. When they go to make their complete circle, they have one area out here that the folks have come in from the Soil Conservation Service or the Corps of Engineers and said this is a wetlands and you cannot run your irrigation system over that area. What they have to do is to run that system for the 199 acres to this point, and bring it back around the other way to that point, and bring it back around, instead of going all the way through an area that is really just a low spot in a field, but yet it has been designated as wetlands.

It is just as frustrating as it can be to the American farmer to have to deal with those types of regulations. That is the type of regulations that we dealt with in our Contract With America, and that I am hoping will get through the Senate side over there so we will have something positive to take back home and say, folks, we know we have to change these programs. We know we have less money to deal with, but this is what we are doing to offset that and to make you a more efficient farmer and allow you to continue to make the same money you are making even though you will not have as much money from the Federal programs as what you may have had in the past.

Mr. JONES. Would the gentleman from Georgia yield for a moment?

Mr. LAHOOD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would relate to the gentlemen from Georgia and Illinois a little story.

About 2 years ago a good friend of mine, who is the President of a community college in North Carolina, had a situation develop, because about 6 or 8 years ago the environmentalists come

down and designated or said that there are cockaded readheaded woodpeckers in a group of pie trees on this community college campus. In 1992-93, obviously, again, I am going back six years ago when they told the President of the college that you have this cockaded readheaded woodpecker, and some of us have trouble saying that, in some of your trees, well, the college was growing and they had determined that they needed to clear some land to put up a new school building on campus. They cut down pine trees.

This gentleman is a farmer by trade. Again, he is president of a community college. I do not know of anyone who cares more about family and land than this individual. It happened a nest of the cockaded readheaded woodpeckers in one tree was cut down, and I would advise the gentleman from Georgia and Illinois, that my friend was fined \$100,000 because that one tree went down with that nest in it. Again, that is why the people, not only farmers, but the people are looking for some fairness and balance in these rules and regulations.

That is just one example. I am sure you will have many more.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are many other examples, I know, and I think, as we get into the farm bill, I think what the farmers from your part of the country and my part of the country want is fairness.

Many of the people in agriculture are for a balanced budget. They want it. They know that it will help them, and they know it will bring down interest rates, improve their ability to borrow the money to put their feed and seed into the ground, and so they are committed to that, but they want it to be fair and balanced. They want less regulation, they want less rules, they want less government intervention, and they want an export market.

If we can deliver on that through our farm bill, I think we will have done a great deal as the 104th Congress moves ahead and really tries to improve the idea that agriculture is important; that people work hard at it. They want to make a fair wage. They don't need a lot of government involvement, and that is what I am hearing from the folks in my district.

I am going to wrap up here.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Would the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. LAHOOD. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention one thing we have not really touched on, and I know there are a lot of folks out there looking tonight that really are like so many Members of Congress, and they have no concept of why you need farm programs. All they hear about are these farm subsidies. Let me just say that they are not really farm subsidies, they are investments in the economy of this country. The farm programs are investments in the U.S. agricultural industry.

For example, in the peanut industry, we have over 150,000 U.S. jobs that are directly related to the peanut industry. It generates over \$6 billion a year in the economy of this country. It generates some \$200 million in exports. That is just one small segment of the agricultural community.

Why we have these programs is that in order for our farmers to be able to compete on the world market against countries like France and like Spain, who so heavily subsidize their farmers, we have to put our farmers on somewhat of a level playing field.

Even though our programs do not put them there, we are still way below the subsidies that are paid in France and in Spain, but we are putting our farmers in a position where they can compete in the global market.

As we move into the post NAFTA and post GATT era, we have to do a better job of that, and I just wanted to mention that because I know there are a lot of people out there that just think that subsidies are bad and they ought not be paid to farmers and they do not understand why farm programs even exist, and I wanted to mention that.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia's contribution, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for any concluding remarks.

Mr. JONES. —I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just very quickly, I wanted to repeat one figure I shared early on. The USDA spends \$16 million to administer and oversee the tobacco program, which, again, is a no net cost program. That \$16 million, I would mention to the gentleman from Illinois and Georgia, brings back in the way of revenues \$25.9 billion. You gentlemen are very smart, good businessmen. Do not know anywhere where you can invest \$16 million and you can bring back \$29.9 million? I would buy that opportunity every day.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, that is a significant contribution.

Let me conclude by saying that we can reform farm programs to make them more accountable to taxpayers and program participants, but in doing so we must not take for granted the incredible success of American agriculture and the role prudent public policy has made to foster this success.

In conclusion, I want to mention that I have developed, like I know both of you gentleman have, a new respect for the men and women who till the soil, who work hard every day in terms of the crops that they grow. Since being elected to Congress, I have had several opportunities, as I know you have to meet the men and women who till the soil, and I have concluded that they love their way of life, are deeply proud of the country and the benefits it has bestowed on each of them, and ask for no compliments for feeding the world each and every day, but want, for their children, the ability to pass along the heritage and the fruits that they have

so richly worked for and who could ask for more than that.

I know each of you, as I do, commend those men and women who till the soil every day, and work hard every day, and make America the great country that it is, and provide the food and fiber for all Americans and many, many citizens in this country and around the world.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RAMSTAD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

Mr. BILBRAY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. VOLKMER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 6 p.m., on account of illness of spouse.

Mr. TORRES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness in the family.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical illness.

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for August 1 and 2, 1995, on account of dedication of U.S.S. *Indianapolis* Memorial in Indianapolis.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WARD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MFUME) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day, today and July 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WAXMAN, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$10,922.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MFUME) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Ms. RIVERS.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. STOKES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. WELDON of Florida.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. DEFAZIO, on H.R. 2002, in the Committee of the Whole today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 638. An act to authorize appropriations for United States insular areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1023. An act to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995 and 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Transportation and Infrastructure.

S.J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that the committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

On July 21, 1995:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes